



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1459
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/804,540	03/19/2004	Yu-Tai Chia	24061.63 (TSMC2003-0124)	7491
43717 7590 05/20/2008 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP 901 Main Street Suite 3100 Dallas, TX 75202				
EXAMINER RIES, LAURIE ANNE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2176				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/20/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/804,540

Applicant(s)

CHIA ET AL.

Examiner

LAURIE RIES

Art Unit

2176

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/19/04
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Original Application, filed 19 March 2004, and IDS, filed 19 March 2004.
2. Claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1, 10, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1, 4, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1).

As per independent claim 1, McDonald discloses a method for generating a primary document for a device in a semiconductor manufacturing environment, wherein the primary document is used to characterize the device, and wherein the primary document is generated using a computer associated with the semiconductor manufacturing environment (See McDonald, Abstract) including creating a design rule

that defines a relationship between first and second technologies, such as allowing end users to design online dynamic interactive data about various products (See McDonald, Column 4, lines 41-67).

McDonald also discloses creating a primary document template for a device in the first technology, such as a .tpl file template to support one or more integrated circuits to be simulated (See McDonald, Column 7, lines 47-50, and Column 8, lines 4-13).

McDonald also discloses creating at least one input file to associate information from a plurality of secondary documents with the primary document template (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 28-34).

McDonald also discloses generating the primary document by retrieving information from the secondary documents and inserting the retrieved information into the primary document template based on the input file (See McDonald, Column 9, lines 46-62).

McDonald also discloses applying the design rule to identify a corresponding device in the second technology (Figure 2B).

As per dependent claim 4, McDonald discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald also discloses performing a simulation using a model of the device, wherein the simulation produces information for insertion into the primary document template (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 20-27).

As per dependent claim 9, McDonald discloses the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald also discloses that creating the primary document

template includes creating a plurality of sections and subsections, wherein at least some of the sections and subsections are associated with an input file, such as a netlist (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 16-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chuang (U.S. Patent 7,246,240 B1).

As per dependent claim 2, McDonald teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald does not teach expressly creating a device truth table. Chuang teaches creating a truth table for simulating semiconductors (See Chuang, Column 12, lines 34-48). McDonald and Chuang are analogous are because they are from the same field of endeavor of performing logical functions using a computer to derive a result. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art to include the creation of a truth table of Chuang with the document generation method of McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to express what outcome will result from the provision of specific signals or logic states at the input of a particular logic gate (See Chuang, Column 12, lines 45-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chuang with McDonald for the benefit of expressing what outcome will result from the provision of specific signals or logic states at the input of a particular logic gate to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chen (U.S. Patent 7,263,477 B2).

As per dependent claim 3, McDonald teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald does not teach expressly retrieving information from a model card assigned to the device. Chen teaches using a model card to determine the model parameters for a semiconductor device (See Chen, Column 1, lines 43-60). McDonald and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simulating semiconductor devices. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the model card of Chen with the generation of a primary document to characterize a device of McDonald. The

motivation for doing so would have been to emulate the behavior of the semiconductor device in an integrated circuit (See Chen, Column 1, lines 52-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chen with McDonald for the benefit of emulating the behavior of the semiconductor device in an integrated circuit to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

6. Claims 5-7, 10, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1) in view of Chisaka (U.S. Patent 5,623,655).

As per dependent claim 5, McDonald teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald does not teach expressly sending a notification that the corresponding device in the second technology should be updated to reflect the primary document. Chisaka teaches sending a notification to a user to indicate that a shared document has been updated (See Chisaka, Abstract). While Chisaka does not teach that the notification states the second technology should be updated, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to update the second technology to reflect the correct information contained in the primary document, providing the benefit of keeping all technologies current and up-to-date for future reference. McDonald and Chisaka are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of combining data to form a shared primary or synthesized document. At the time of the

invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the notification of Chisaka with the generation of a primary document of McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to inform users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chisaka with McDonald for the benefit of to informing users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

As per dependent claim 6, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 5 as described above. While McDonald and Chisaka do not teach expressly defining a period of time in which a response to the notification must be submitted, it was well known in the art at the time of the invention to set response time limits for various electronic notifications. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a period of time in which a response to a notification, such as the notification taught by McDonald and Chisaka, must be submitted, providing the benefit of restricting additional changes to the primary document once a certain date/time has been reached such that the final version of the document may be distributed.

As per dependent claim 7, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 6 as described above. Chisaka also teaches that the response indicates that the update is performed or not performed (See Chisaka, Abstract). . McDonald and Chisaka are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of

combining data to form a shared primary or synthesized document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the notification indicating whether an update is performed or not performed of Chisaka with the generation of a primary document of McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to inform users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents or that no change is needed to the other shared documents. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chisaka with McDonald for the benefit of to informing users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents or that no change is needed to the other shared documents to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

As per independent claim 10, McDonald teaches a method for generating a primary document in a semiconductor fabrication environment using a plurality of secondary documents and at least one input file (See McDonald, Abstract) including defining at least a first device within a first technology area and a second device within a second technology area, wherein the first and second devices include at least one common element (See McDonald, Figure 2B, such as ## Device having common elements template files and simulators).

McDonald also teaches updating information defining the common element with respect to the first device (See McDonald, Column 9, lines 46-62).

McDonald also teaches generating a primary document for the first device based on the updated information (See McDonald, Column 9, lines 46-62).

McDonald does not teach expressly sending a notification that the common element has been updated with respect to the first device and determining whether to update the common element with respect to the second device.

Chisaka teaches sending a notification to a user to indicate that a shared document has been updated (See Chisaka, Abstract). While Chisaka does not teach that the notification states the second technology should be updated, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to update the second technology to reflect the correct information contained in the primary document, providing the benefit of keeping all technologies current and up-to-date for future reference. McDonald and Chisaka are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of combining data to form a shared primary or synthesized document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the notification of Chisaka with the generation of a primary document of McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to inform users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chisaka with McDonald for the benefit of to informing users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

As per dependent claim 14, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. McDonald also teaches generating a monitoring report based on the primary document to show whether the common element was updated

Art Unit: 2176

with respect to the second device (See McDonald, Column 14, lines 47-67, and Column 15, lines 1-12).

As per dependent claim 17, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. McDonald also teaches identifying a model associated with the first device, and executing a simulation using the model to provide simulation results, wherein updating information defining the common element with respect to the first device uses the simulation results (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 20-64).

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1), as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Chisaka (U.S. Patent 5,623,655) and Chen (U.S. Patent 7,263,477 B2).

As per dependent claim 8, McDonald teaches the limitations of claim 1 as described above. McDonald does not teach expressly providing an instruction set for parsing the input file and generating the primary document. Kunitake teaches an instruction set for parsing an input file to create a synthesized document (See Kunitake, Column 14, lines 16-67, and Column 17, lines 1-18). McDonald and Kunitake are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating a primary electronic document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the instruction set for parsing an input file of Kunitake with the generation of a primary document to characterize a device of McDonald. The

motivation for doing so would have been to determine which portions of the input document should be included in the generated document and how the portions of the input file should be formatted in the generated document. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kunitake with McDonald for the benefit of determining which portions of the input document should be included in the generated document and how the portions of the input file should be formatted in the generated document to obtain the invention as specified in claim 8.

8. Claims 11-13, 18-20, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1) in view of Chisaka (U.S. Patent 5,623,655) and Kunitake (U.S. Patent 7,069,501 B2).

As per dependent claim 11, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. McDonald also teaches dividing a primary document template into a plurality of sections, such as netlists (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 16-19). McDonald also teaches creating an input file for at least some of the sections, wherein each input file defines information to be inserted into the corresponding section (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 28-34). McDonald also teaches combining a plurality of sections into the primary document based on the primary document template (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 16-19). McDonald and Chisaka do not teach expressly providing an instruction set forming rules for parsing a plurality of secondary documents

associated with the first device and applying the rules to extract information from the secondary documents, wherein the extraction includes parsing the information and inserting the parsed information into the corresponding section based on the input file. Kunitake teaches an instruction set that forms rules for parsing secondary documents associated with a first device (See Kunitake, Column 19, lines 42-67, and Column 20, lines 1-29). Kunitake also teaches applying the rules to extract information from secondary documents that includes parsing the information and inserting the parsed information into a corresponding section based on the input file (See Kunitake, Column 21, lines 7-63). McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating a primary electronic document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the instruction set forming rules for parsing secondary documents and inserting the parsed information into the corresponding section based on the input file, as taught by Kunitake, with the generation of a primary document of McDonald and Chisaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to combine related data from various input files in the appropriate location within the primary document template such that the data is easily read and understood. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kunitake with McDonald and Chisaka for the benefit of combining related data from various input files in the appropriate location within the primary document template such that the data is easily read and understood to obtain the invention as specified in claim 11.

As per dependent claim 12, McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. Kunitake also teaches that each input file identifies which of the secondary documents to parse for the corresponding section (See Kunitake, Column 34, lines 29-67, and Column 35, lines 1-30). McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of creating a primary electronic document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the identification of which secondary document to parse of Kunitake with the parsing of data to generate a primary document of McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that related data is included in an associated section of the primary document such that the data is easily read and understood. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kunitake with McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake for the benefit of ensuring that related data is included in an associated section of the primary document such that the data is easily read and understood to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

As per dependent claim 13, McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake teach the limitations of claim 11 as described above. McDonald also teaches that each section includes a text body and at least one field embedded in the text body, wherein information is inserted into the field (See McDonald, Figure 21, Column 15, lines 49-67, Column 8, lines 65-67, and Column 9, lines 1-9).

As per independent claim 18, McDonald teaches a system for combining a plurality of secondary documents into a primary document for use in a semiconductor

manufacturing system (See McDonald, Abstract) including the plurality of secondary documents, such as netlists, wherein each secondary document is associated with a first or second technology (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 16-19).

McDonald also teaches a device definition table describing a first semiconductor device formed in accordance with the first technology and a second semiconductor device formed in accordance with the second technology, wherein the first and second devices contain a common element (See McDonald, Figure 2B, such as ## Device having common elements template files and simulators).

McDonald also teaches a primary document template for the first device and a plurality of input files corresponding to sections of the primary document template (See McDonald, Column 7, lines 47-50, and Column 8, lines 4-13).

McDonald does not teach expressly a primary document assembly engine for generating the primary document, the engine adapted to execute a plurality of instructions including instructions for applying a predefined set of rules to parse information from the secondary documents based on the input files when the common element is updated with respect to the first device; instructions for inserting the parsed information into the corresponding sections based on the input files; instructions for combining the sections into the primary document based on the primary document template; and instructions for notifying a user responsible for the second device that the common element has been updated with respect to the first device.

Chisaka teaches sending a notification to a user to indicate that a shared document has been updated (See Chisaka, Abstract).

Kunitake teaches a primary document assembly engine for generating the primary document (See Kunitake, Figure 27, and Column 3, lines 55-63), the engine adapted to execute a plurality of instructions including instructions for applying a predefined set of rules to parse information from the secondary documents based on the input files when the common element is updated with respect to the first device (See Kunitake, Column 14, lines 16-67, and Column 15, lines 1-18); instructions for inserting the parsed information into the corresponding sections based on the input files (See Kunitake, Column 21, lines 7-63); and instructions for combining the sections into the primary document based on the primary document template (See Kunitake, Column 43, lines 18-57).

McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of combining data to form a shared primary or synthesized document.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the notification of Chisaka with the generation of a primary document of McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to inform users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents.

At the time of the invention it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the predefined set of rules to parse information based on input files and insertion of the parsed information into corresponding sections based on the input files, as taught by Kunitake, with the generation of a primary document of

McDonald. The motivation for doing so would have been to combine related data from various input files in the appropriate location within the primary document template such that the data is easily read and understood.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chisaka and Kunitake with McDonald for the benefit of to informing users that a change has been made to the primary document that might affect the data in other shared documents, and for the benefit of combining related data from various input files in the appropriate location within the primary document template such that the data is easily read and understood, to obtain the invention as specified in claim 18.

As per dependent claim 19, McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake teach the limitations of claim 18 as described above. McDonald also teaches a plurality of manufacturing entities containing the secondary documents; and a network connecting the manufacturing entities with the primary document assembly engine (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 4-19).

As per dependent claim 20, McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake teach the limitations of claim 18 as described above. Kunitake also teaches instructions for automatically converting information from the secondary documents into a predefined format (See Kunitake, Column 7, lines 45-56). McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of combining data to form a shared primary or synthesized document. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the automatic conversion of information from the secondary documents into a predefined format, as taught by

Kunitake, with the generation of a primary document, as taught by McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake. The motivation for doing so would have been to ensure that all data is uniformly presented to the reader such that it may be easily readable. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kunitake with McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake for the benefit of ensuring that all data is uniformly presented to the reader such that it may be easily readable to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

As per dependent claim 22, McDonald, Chisaka, and Kunitake teach the limitations of claim 18 as described above. McDonald also teaches instructions for executing a simulation using a model of the first device; and instructions for including results from the simulation when generating the primary document (See McDonald, Column 8, lines 20-27).

9. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald (U.S. Patent 6,530,065 B1) in view of Chisaka (U.S. Patent 5,623,655) and Chen (U.S. Patent 7,263,477 B2).

As per dependent claim 15, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. McDonald and Chisaka do not teach expressly updating a model card assigned to a model representing the first device. Chen teaches updating a model card to determine the model parameters for a semiconductor device (See Chen, Column 1, lines 43-60). McDonald, Chisaka and Chen are analogous art because they

are from the same field of endeavor of simulating multiple devices. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the updating of a model card of Chen with the generation of a primary document to characterize a device of McDonald and Chisaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to emulate the behavior of the semiconductor device in an integrated circuit (See Chen, Column 1, lines 52-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chen with McDonald and Chisaka for the benefit of emulating the behavior of the semiconductor device in an integrated circuit to obtain the invention as specified in claim 15.

As per dependent claim 16, McDonald and Chisaka teach the limitations of claim 10 as described above. McDonald and Chisaka do not teach expressly updating an import file assigned to a model representing the first device. Chen teaches updating an import file assigned to a model (See Chen, Column 1, lines 43-60). McDonald, Chisaka and Chen are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of simulating multiple devices. At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the updating of an import file assigned to a model representing the first device of Chen with the generation of a primary document to characterize a device of McDonald and Chisaka. The motivation for doing so would have been to correctly emulate the behavior of the first device in an integrated circuit (See Chen, Column 1, lines 52-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Chen with McDonald and Chisaka for the benefit of correctly emulating the behavior of the first device in an integrated circuit to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Allowable Subject Matter

10. Claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Matsumoto (U.S. Publication 2002/0177260 A1) discloses a semiconductor device and method of fabricating the same.
- Graves (U.S. Publication 2005/0055636 A1) discloses dynamic editing of multimedia content for real-time applications.
- McLean discloses a framework for standard modular simulation.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Laurie Ries whose telephone number is (571) 272-4095. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton, can be reached at (571) 272-4137.

13. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Laurie Ries/
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
15 May 2008